From:

Dylan Hanser <d.hanser_@hotmail.com>

Sent:

Friday, March 29, 2019 10:10 PM

To:

Kilbreath, Phillip

Cc:

jodeanb@blueribbonbuilders.com

Subject:

Canyon Ferry

Dear Mr. Kilbreath,

Thanks for opening the comment period again for the no wake law on Canyon Ferry Lake. Please consider NOT imposing the no wake zone around the cabins at Canyon Ferry.

Sent from my iPhone

From:

Twenty2off@gmail.com

Sent:

Friday, March 29, 2019 8:21 PM

To:

Kilbreath, Phillip

Subject:

Public Comment: Notice of Extension of Comment Period Pertaining to No Wake Zones

on Canyon Ferry Reservoir

Name: Lisa Kallio City: Helena

I believe that the no wake zone should be extended to 200 feet from docks. It should extend all the way to the back of Kayley bay as well as there are many houses with docks in that area that need protection from wakes. With the increased number of wakeboard and surf boats on the lake the safety of my children is in question. I do not feel they are safe to play on our dock any more. They have been knocked off by the large wakes of boats cruising too close to our dock and they cannot safely paddle board on our beach without getting tipped over by the enormous wakes. The damage to our dock and any boats tied up is also extensive.

From:

skiboatdriver@gmail.com

Sent:

Friday, March 29, 2019 8:17 PM

To:

Kilbreath, Phillip

Subject:

Public Comment: Notice of Extension of Comment Period Pertaining to No Wake Zones

on Canyon Ferry Reservoir

Name: Robert Bird

City: Helena

The No Wake zone needs to extend to the back of Kayley Bay as well. There are houses and docks there that won't be protected with the proposed no Wake zone. Otherwise, I think it looks awesome!!! Thank you for your hard work on this.

From:

Luke Bing < luke.m.bing@gmail.com>

Sent:

Friday, March 29, 2019 4:47 PM

То:

Kilbreath, Phillip

Subject:

Kaylay bay

To whom it may concern,

I spend every weekend all summer water skiing and wake boarding at canyon ferry and would be crushed if the no wake rules were imposed. The no wake rules would take away an important part of Montana recreating that I have enjoyed since I was a child. Please consider not imposing the no wake rules in front of the cabins.

Luke

From:

Heather Bing <heather.marie.bing@gmail.com>

Sent:

Friday, March 29, 2019 12:48 PM

To:

Kilbreath, Phillip

Subject:

Do not impose no wake canyon ferry

To whom it may concern,

We spend many of our summer weekends at Canyon Ferry recreating. We especially enjoy our family and friends and cabin time on the lake. Our recreation time includes fishing, water sports such as skiing, tubing and wake boarding. Please consider **not imposing no wake rules** in front of the cabins.

Thank you.

From:

lisa whorrall <rockinlw@outlook.com>

Sent:

Friday, March 29, 2019 12:36 PM

To:

Kilbreath, Phillip

Subject:

no wake rules

To whom it may concern,

We spend many of our summer weekends at Canyon Ferry recreating. We especially enjoy our family and friends and cabin time on the lake. Our recreation time includes fishing, water sports such as skiing, tubing and wake boarding. Please consider **not imposing no wake rules** in front of the cabins.

Thank you, Pat and Lisa Whorrall

Sent from Mail for Windows 10

From:

viturner1990@mt.net

Sent:

Tuesday, March 26, 2019 8:15 PM

To:

Kilbreath, Phillip

Subject:

Public Comment: Notice of Extension of Comment Period Pertaining to No Wake Zones

on Canyon Ferry Reservoir

Name: Vicki Turner

City: Helena

The rule does not indicate who is going to enforce the 300' No Wake Zone. Given there is already a 200' No Wake Zone around the proposed area, with rarely any observable enforcement, it is difficult to make the connection that a deterrence or threat of deterrance is realistic. The rule and inforamtion provided does not have any fiscal impact noted. Who, what is the methodology and how much is it going to cost to educate the public regarding this change when it is doubtful that the public knows about the current 300' No Wake Zone. Those citing errosion issues due to water craft wave have NO idea about what it is like to lose several hundred feet of shoreline due to the fluctuating water levels, the water craft waves are a drop in the bucket compared to single storm consisting of wind, rollers and the high water levels that spring and early summer bring to Canyon Ferry Lake. We experience more erosion in one day than an entire boating season of water craft waves. This proposal seems unrealistic to enforce, the state lacks the public dollars to fund a public education campaign to even try to change norms, and the proposed rule doesn't resolve any erosion issues, and I do not support it.

March 26,2019

PKilbreathFWP.Mt.Gov

I would like to comment on the Canyon ferry No Wake Areas.

As I commented back in November I live on Magpie bay & am very much in favor

Of NO WAKE ZONE 200 feet from the shore line on the whole north end of the lake.

This has been needed for a very long time .

This should hopefully prevent a major accident or injury to recreationist along the shore which has been close to happening many times lately.

Thank you for your consideration;

Gene Mitchell

3761 Pirate Point Road

Helena , Montana 59602 Phone # 406 475 3150

REPRESENTATIVE JIM KEANE HOUSE DISTRICT 73 BUTTE MT 59701

March 25, 2019

Montana Fish Wildlife and Parks Commission

Dear Members of the Commission:

I am asking the Commission to reconsider or modify their proposed no wake zone at Canyon Ferry. Canyon Ferry was built as part of the Pick Sloan dam projects conceived in the 1940s. The primary purposes of Canyon Ferry Dam were three: irrigation, generation, and recreation. These three were of equal value in the plan. The reason the cabin sites sit at Canyon Ferry was because of this recreation component in the plan, and the cabin sites worked to bring recreation in the early 50's to Canyon Ferry Dam. Boating was a big part of why people purchased and built cabin sites at Canyon Ferry.

The proposed no wake zone certainly would limit the boating use on the North end of Canyon Ferry Lake in a negative way. Cabin sites with docks would no longer be allowed to have wakes leaving or returning to their docks, such as water skiing, tubing or fishing. Also, Canyon Ferry Lake elevation is constantly changing and will continue to change as long as the lake exists. This is part of the Pick Sloan's regulation of the Missouri River waters. It is unfair to punish boat users on the North end of the lake by creating a no wake zone that truly limits the intended federal purposes of the lake.

Please consider my request.

Sincerely,

Representative Jim Keane

House District 73

From:

Thomas, Patrick < Pat. Thomas@northwestern.com>

Sent:

Monday, March 25, 2019 5:39 PM

To:

Kilbreath, Phillip

Subject:

Canyon Ferry No Wake Zone Comments

Canyon Ferry No Wake Comments

After reviewing and following last year's no wake recommendations and now this year's additions I have the following comments that I would hope would be considered. I believe it is a good idea to have a no wake zone in the busiest parts of the lake defined in 2018's draft. I even think this year's whole northern end, 200 foot zone is a good idea and comprise.

The one specific bay that would affect me specifically would be Court Sherriff Bay. I camp at this bay more than 50 days a summer. I think it would be good to have a no wake zone within this bay but not out as far as 2018's draft designates. I think that about half the distance recommended would be sufficient, right around the mid-point of the island. There actually was a no wake buoy there for many years which stopped boats before a designated swim area, which also used to be there. Extended the no wake zone to where the two points come together out past the town is over kill.

First of all, paddle boards and kayaks usually stay within the bay itself. There is very little to no traffic that comes and goes from the bay that extends into the city (nothing in that bay). Getting boats to slow down and stop as they pass the island would help this bay tremendously. Adding an additional 600 feet past the island is too much. If a camper parked their boat within the channel all the way in this bay (next to their campsite), according to your own map and distance scale that boat would have around 2000 feet (about 4 ½ inches on the map scale) to go until they are out of the no wake zone. That is about 3 times as long as Kim's Marina currently is.

Thank you for your time and I hope you can take my comments into account when a final decision is made.

Patrick Thomas Butte MT

This message is for the named person's use only. It may contain confidential, proprietary or legally privileged information. No confidentiality or privilege is waived or lost by any mistransmission. If you receive this message in error, please immediately delete it and all copies of it from your system, destroy any hard copies of it and notify the sender. You must not, directly or indirectly, use, disclose, distribute, print, or copy any part of this message if you are not the intended recipient. NorthWestern Corporation and its subsidiaries each reserve the right to monitor all e-mail communications through its network.

My name is Kurt Westra. I own a cabin at 3763 Pirate Point Rd Helena Montana. It is located along the shoreline of Magpie Bay. I want to express my strong support on the 200 foot no wake zone proposal on north end of Canyon Ferry Lake. My wife and I have seven kids and love Canyon Ferry Lake. We fish, boat, tube, wakeboard, water ski, swim, and Kayak on the lake. In Magpie Bay there are many Adults and kids who enjoy paddle boarding, fishing, kayaking, and use paddle boats. Many of these activities are very dangerous because of the lack of respect of some boaters and the amount of boat traffic. We are very concerned about the safety in Magpie bay with the very high amount of boat traffic, large wakes, and at high speeds. There are times where rules should be made to keep people safe. I believe that Magpie Bay should be a no wake bay, or at a minimum there should be a 200-300 foot no wake zone enforced from all docks and shorelines in the entire bay.

This past summer my 8 year old son was nearly hit by a boat. He was swimming about 15 feet off the end of our dock and a boat went flying by within 20 feet of the end of our dock. At this time all my kids where on the dock and it was very obvious the kids were swimming. Thankfully our son saw the boat coming and swam toward the dock. We consistently have boats going by at a high rate of speed within 30 -40 feet or our dock while our kids are swimming and on the dock. In Magpie bay there are always people out enjoying the lake along the shoreline. I see as almost as many people swimming, and enjoying the lake along the sides of the bay as by the boat ramp and campground. Almost every day on the weekend we have wake surfing boats going around and around in the bay for 8+ hours making 3-4 foot tall waves that come crashing into the docks and shoreline. These waves are causing a high amount of shoreline erosion. The surfing boats will come within 60 feet of the docks causing huge waves all along the docks and shoreline. The waves will be so high that standing or laying on the docks is almost impossible as the waves are crashing in. The high wakes are causing damage to the shoreline, the docks, and boats that are docked. Also the large amounts of large wakes in the bay cause navigating the bay by boat dangerous between all the boat traffic.

Last summer my family spent at least 20 days on the lake. It only seems like common sense to create/enforce more restrictions to keep people safe on Magpie bay and the north end of Canyon Ferry Reservoir. The other added benefit of the 200 foot no wake zone will add a lot of safety for the fishermen who mostly are within 200 feet of shore and are trolling slowly or jigging. Many of the fishermen are harassed by the high speed boats racing in very close proximity to them.

I believe someone is going to get hurt or killed if something is not done to slow down the boat traffic and wakes in the bay. I am strongly supporting your proposal for the 200 foot no wake zone on the north end of Canyon Ferry Reservoir. I believe this will the lake much safer for everyone who use it but still leaves plenty of room for everyone to have fun and play.

Thank you,

Kurt Westra

3395 Heeb Rd

Manhattan, Mt. 59741

Phone- 406-579-4022 email-shop@vddrilling.com

From:

jfbriggs@gmail.com

Sent:

Friday, March 22, 2019 1:13 PM

To:

Kilbreath, Phillip

Subject:

Public Comment: Notice of Extension of Comment Period Pertaining to No Wake Zones

on Canyon Ferry Reservoir

Name: Jeff Briggs

City: Helena

I fully support the no wake zone at Canyon Ferry. Speeding boats are a significant hazard to swimmers as well as fishing boats. In addition, the erosion caused by the large wakes intentionally caused by wake surfing type boats can be significant.

From:

clint0357@gmail.com

Sent:

Friday, March 22, 2019 7:44 AM

To:

Kilbreath, Phillip

Subject:

Public Comment: Notice of Extension of Comment Period Pertaining to No Wake Zones

on Canyon Ferry Reservoir

Name: Clinton W. Crawford

City: Townsend

Personally I would support the ban of all motorized craft on canyon ferry. It's getting too crowded and people are speeding around like morons. Someone is gonna get hurt if we don't crack down on people mishandling water craft on this reservoir. I've come close to being hit by stupid boaters several times now. I've lived in Townsend for 27 years I should be able to enjoy the lake where I live without having to worry about getting hit by some idiot just because my craft doesn't have a motor.

From:

Lsiroky@aol.com

Sent:

Friday, March 22, 2019 6:46 AM

To:

Kilbreath, Phillip

Subject:

Public Comment: Notice of Extension of Comment Period Pertaining to No Wake Zones

on Canyon Ferry Reservoir

Name: Laurence Siroky

City: Helena

Great, thanks for listening to landowners, swimmers, kayakers and others utilizing the water and shores of Canyon Ferry.

From:

mose@mt.net

Sent:

Friday, March 22, 2019 6:09 AM

To:

Kilbreath, Phillip

Subject:

Public Comment: Notice of Extension of Comment Period Pertaining to No Wake Zones

on Canyon Ferry Reservoir

Name: Steve Mosby

City: Helena

No need for this just another regulation that is crazy....

From:

B Nielsen <kelseya.b@gmail.com>

Sent:

Thursday, March 21, 2019 11:59 AM

To:

Kilbreath, Phillip

Subject:

Canyon Ferry Reservoir proposed "Slow No Wake" zone.

Hello Phil Kilbreath!

Categorically, we agree with "Slow No Wake" zones that enhance safe traffic and operations, and also provide a courtesy to other folks nearby, other users, and protects resources. We believe that folks usually can govern themselves, but sometimes we need a little guidance and advice.

Thanks for all you folks do at FWP for us--we do appreciate your work.

Sincerely "Bo"

B T Nielsen, M.L.A.

241-7399, 2245 Sunlite Ln, Missoula MT 59804

From:

Fishtalesbykevin@gmail.com <Fishtalesbykevin@gmail.com>

Sent:

Wednesday, March 20, 2019 10:18 PM

To:

Kilbreath, Phillip

Subject:

Public Comment: Notice of Extension of Comment Period Pertaining to No Wake Zones

on Canyon Ferry Reservoir

Name: Kevin

City:

Do you plan to enforce this new no-wake zone on CF? I doubt it. You currently have a no-wake zone between Beaver Ck & Hauser dam. There is absolutely No enforcement there! NONE. Ask your FWP creel check techs, they see it too.

From:

Ah@mt.net

Sent:

Wednesday, March 20, 2019 7:47 PM

To:

Kilbreath, Phillip

Subject:

Public Comment: Notice of Extension of Comment Period Pertaining to No Wake Zones

on Canyon Ferry Reservoir

Name: Aaron Helfert City: East Helena

This new No Wake Zone is a bunch of shit. All public recreation and marine areas are already No Wake. First of all, who the hell is going to inforce this? Second, a good day of heavy wind on this lake will cause more erosion than an entire summer of boat activity. Third, I?m sick and tired of government telling us what to do. Fourth, there are surf boats that can be 500 feet from shore and will make massive waves on the shore. Fifth, if there is a 200 foot No Wake Zone on the north end of the lake no one will be able to create wake between the cliffs at Overlook and the island. Maybe we should just turn this into a ?no motor boat lake?. Further more, do you know what the exact definition of ?wake? is? Look it up. You may be surprised.

From:

carol hughes <carolt_76@yahoo.com>

Sent:

Wednesday, March 20, 2019 4:46 PM

To:

Kilbreath, Phillip

Subject:

No wake zone @ Canyon Ferry

I understand the cabin owners concerns. The north end of Canyon Ferry is a very popular area with many boats pulling surfers, tubers and skiers especially on weekends and holidays. There is a lot of congestion in that area because of the power boats, jet skis and sailboats. Too many power boaters go too fast and many are drinking. Many do not follow the basic rules governing power boats and sailboats. I have both types of boats and my son and daughter in law also have a jet ski. I do support these uses. When you throw in the fishermen it can get very congested from the island into the marinas, campgrounds and boat launches. The 200 ft no wake zone may be a solution for the cabin owners but you should also look at how you are going to manage the area from the island north. Boats going at high speeds in that area is a safety issue.

Spike Thompson Great Falls Sent from my iPhone

From:

amyjalockmer@hotmail.com

Sent:

Wednesday, March 20, 2019 4:15 PM

To:

Kilbreath, Phillip

Subject:

Public Comment: Notice of Extension of Comment Period Pertaining to No Wake Zones

on Canyon Ferry Reservoir

Name:

City:

I am not a fan of the 200' no wake zone that is proposed. This lake is too narrow for that to be effective and allow people to recreate as they like to currently at the north end of the lake. There are already no wake zones in the areas that need it and that is sufficient. How will this be enforced? Erosion occurs worse when storms blow in and the water is high. This proposal cuts down on the usage of the lake for the public and landowners on the lake.

From:

kquinn@rpa-hln.com

Sent:

Tuesday, March 19, 2019 11:21 AM

To:

Kilbreath, Phillip

Subject:

Public Comment: Notice of Extension of Comment Period Pertaining to No Wake Zones

on Canyon Ferry Reservoir

Name: Kelly Quinn

City: Helena

I am writing to express my opposition to the proposed No Wake Zone on the North end of Canyon Ferry Reservoir. The proposed No Wake Zone is obviously an effort by some cabin owners, recreationists and the FWP to interfere with boaters enjoying the lake. The proposed No Wake Zone will have no impact on shoreline erosion. The erosion of the shoreline is caused by high water levels and wind. The Montana Boating Laws already have No Wake Rules to address docks, swimming areas, divers, etc. The FWP needs to enforce the existing No Wake rules that are in place for Montana and not add another set of rules that will not be enforced.

From:

drapesfamily@hotmail.com

Sent:

Tuesday, March 19, 2019 9:57 AM

To:

Kilbreath, Phillip

Subject:

Public Comment: Notice of Extension of Comment Period Pertaining to No Wake Zones

on Canyon Ferry Reservoir

Name: Greg Drapes

City:

To Whom it May Concern:

In general, I'm supportive of having certain high-traffic areas marked as no-wake zones, but I'm opposed to the broad area covered by this regulation, with the following reasons:

- This will likely lead to conflict between different constituencies on the lake. Currently, people need to be respectful of others on the lake. This regulation will embolden certain individuals to appoint themselves as "traffic cops" empowered to enforce the rule, and the distance, as they perceive it.
- As a family, we swim, fish, ski, surf, paddle board, tube, and basically do anything else we can think of on the lake. We want to enjoy all of these things in safety. If someone is on a paddle board and is more than 200' from shore, boaters still need to be respectful and remain at a distance. Likewise, as windy as it is there, if the only calm water for water skiing is within 200' of a protected bank, water skiers should be allowed to be there. At the very least, the regulation should be time-limited to the busier hours on the lake, like weekends and holidays between the hours of 10am-6pm.
- Speaking of the wind, there are times when the only safe way to navigate the lake due to high winds and waves is to hug the shoreline. There should be an exemption for this.
- The area protected is too broad. This could be limited to the busy, north end of the lake from Cemetery Island to the dam, and that should be limited to the hours stated above. Other specific areas around the campgrounds and day-use ares could be restricted preferably using buoys to mark the protected areas.

Thanks.

From:

lakelivin@mt.net

Sent:

Monday, March 18, 2019 8:07 PM

To:

Kilbreath, Phillip

Subject:

Public Comment: Notice of Extension of Comment Period Pertaining to No Wake Zones

on Canyon Ferry Reservoir

Name:

City:

Please do this before someone gets injured or killed in Magpie Bay.

There is way too much congestion - boats, jet skis, kayaks, kids playing- too close to shore. Thanks!

From:

vcardenas92@gmail.com

Sent:

Monday, March 18, 2019 5:22 PM

To:

Kilbreath, Phillip.

Subject:

Public Comment: Notice of Extension of Comment Period Pertaining to No Wake Zones

on Canyon Ferry Reservoir

Name: Veronica Cardenas

City: Helena

I think this is a great idea for safety for water activities and children!

From:

mtgrzlys@hotmail.com

Sent:

Monday, March 18, 2019 1:59 PM

To:

Kilbreath, Phillip

Subject:

Public Comment: Notice of Extension of Comment Period Pertaining to No Wake Zones

on Canyon Ferry Reservoir

Name: Randy Morris

City: Helena

I am in support of the revised no wake zone changes proposed for Canyon Ferry Reservoir as noticed on the Rules published on March 15, 2019.

I would like to suggest that FWP give some consideration to somehow marking (buoys?) the no wake zones so vessel operators know where to reduce speeds. Also, please keep in mind some vessels (PWC & jet propulsions) require acceleration to maintain control.

I am curious as to how this regulation affects vessels that create large wakes for surfing or wakeboarding in that these wakes will carry for hundreds and thousands of feet, often times intruding into this 200 foot wakeless zone?

From:

fishingicon@yahoo.com

Sent:

Monday, March 18, 2019 1:52 PM

To:

Kilbreath, Phillip

Subject:

Public Comment: Notice of Extension of Comment Period Pertaining to No Wake Zones

on Canyon Ferry Reservoir

Name: Tum Roberts

City: Helena

As a cabin owner on the West Shore of Canyon Ferry Lake and as a boater I feel like this is a solution that will make the

lake safer and help control erosion on the shoreline.

Thank you.

From:

jgrant@jmgm.com

Sent:

Monday, March 18, 2019 12:20 PM

To:

Kilbreath, Phillip

Subject:

Public Comment: Notice of Extension of Comment Period Pertaining to No Wake Zones

on Canyon Ferry Reservoir

Name: JOHN H GRANT

City: Helena

The entire Kaylee Bay should be no wake

From:

dtrerise@mt.gov

Sent:

Monday, March 18, 2019 12:17 PM

To:

Kilbreath, Phillip

Subject:

Public Comment: Notice of Extension of Comment Period Pertaining to No Wake Zones

on Canyon Ferry Reservoir

Name: Dick Trerise City: Canyon Ferry

I live on the lake in Magpie Bay. I am in favor of the proposed rule change, however I have concerns. In my life as a school administrator, we followed this principle. Never make a rule that can't be enforced. As a long time lake resident, I have observed that wake issues are caused by both boats and jet skis. Jet skis however, create the most danger of injury to self and others. So how will this be addressed? Is the commission going to allocate resources for patrols, following through on complaints, issuing of citations? A rule is optional if it is not enforceable.

From:

joecardenas92@hotmail.com

Sent:

Monday, March 18, 2019 12:00 PM

To:

Kilbreath, Phillip

Subject:

Public Comment: Notice of Extension of Comment Period Pertaining to No Wake Zones

on Canyon Ferry Reservoir

Name: Joe Cardenas

City: Helena

I strongly support the proposed regulations! These rules will greatly enhance safety in more densely populated and

trafficked areas. Thank you!